

February 5

If this fight is lost—and it can well be lost through continued complacency and inertia—then the face of America as we have known it so long will be drastically altered. As President Kennedy made clear in his budget message to the Congress a few days ago, he no longer believes in the philosophy that progress and prosperity for our Nation can be achieved through the sound principles of a balanced budget and conservative spending policies.

Instead, he has surrendered to the Keynesian philosophy that real prosperity can only be achieved by spending what we don't have for things we don't truly need in the hope this reckless spending binge will produce an artificial kind of prosperity that will keep us afloat in a sea of red ink.

This is one of the most dangerous fiscal gambles any American President has ever embarked upon. If it fails we will have budget deficits of unparalleled peacetime proportions and of such tremendous magnitude and import that our whole financial and economic structure can be wrecked on the shoals of galloping inflation.

Along with this we will have thrust upon us a Federal bureaucracy of truly stupendous size and regimentation. And with the managed news policy that has already been adopted as official administration policy, we will be increasingly told that all this is for our own good and is necessary to get us moving again in the path of progress and sweet prosperity.

It is amazing how many Americans have already fallen for this line of pure guff. As Steve Stahl, head of the Investor's Union, said recently:

"We have traded the Declaration of Independence for the fetish of interdependence. We are transforming the powerful wings of the mighty American eagle into the fluttering feathers of a mother hen—right here at home where we are teaching our children at our own expense that free enterprise has failed and the Government is more capable of managing our affairs than we are ourselves."

Dr. Edward R. Annis, president-elect of the American Medical Association, echoed much the same theme recently when he declared:

"A Federal Government takeover is like poured cement. If you do not struggle while it is being poured, but wait until it is an accomplished fact, it hardens and you never escape."

This is all too true. Right now we have an administration firmly dedicated to vastly increasing the influence of the Federal Government on our daily lives. In just 2 years this administration has added 145,342 persons to the Federal payroll and the payroll padding technique has just started good. It is an administration which thinks nothing of buying Congressional votes with lush patronage jobs and of twisting arms in every way possible to get what it wants. Its political morals come right from the barnyard and it is a complete stranger to the truth unless telling the truth happens to serve its own ends.

This is blunt language to be sure, but it is the kind of language that America must hear and heed if it is to survive another 6 years under the dynasty that is now being built in Washington.

With the kind of politics this administration plays there is only one effective way to keep this administration from getting just what it wants. Congress must be persuaded that the administration program is not the program our people want and the only way that can be done is to mount a letter writing campaign of such effectiveness that our congressional representatives must listen to the voice of the people.

That means that each and every American who is dedicated to preserving constitutional government and sanity in our taxing and spending programs must plunge into this fight and make his or her voice heard where it will do the most good. Sounding off to a neighbor or a friend isn't going to do any good, but sounding off to a Congressman can do a lot of good, and we are going to have to do a lot of that in the months ahead if we are to keep this Nation's head above water.

Let no one kid himself that this administration isn't politically smart. It is the most ruthless and the craftiest political machine that has ever come into power in this country, and it is not the least bit averse to using every trick in the book, including downright falsehood, to stay there.

It is time more Americans woke up to what is going to happen to their country if we don't get some sanity back in Washington. The cold, hard truth happens to be that we are riding for a very nasty fall, and it could be a disastrous one, indeed, unless some checkreins are applied while there is still time.

*Cuba file*  
The Facts on Cuba

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "The Facts on Cuba," published in the Washington Daily News of February 4, 1963.

There being no objection, the editorial was order to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### THE FACTS ON CUBA

Senator JOHN C. STENNIS appropriately likens Soviet troops in Cuba to Soviet missiles in Cuba, as twin menaces to United States and hemispheric security.

The long-range missiles presumably are gone, along with the Russian bombers—though we have no certain proof of it. The Russian troops remain. At his last press conference, President Kennedy estimated the number of Russians on the island at 16,000 to 17,000.

Senator STENNIS, a Democrat, has considerable prestige in both parties in Congress. As chairman of the Senate preparedness subcommittee, he soon will start an investigation of the Cuban buildup. He is well qualified for the job.

The investigation will not be a post mortem on the Bay of Pigs, which Sen. STENNIS aptly terms "spilled milk." Not where we've been but where we are going is the correct point of view.

As Senator STENNIS points out, Cuba rapidly is becoming the second strongest military power in this hemisphere with potential for blackmail, subversion and even invasion of the smaller Latin American countries.

We should have a hard, firm policy, he says, and "it could lead to the proposition that we would have to make demands for this force (the Soviet troops) as we did for the missiles and the bombers." This is an inevitable development, in our opinion.

Expected within hours is a belated order barring U.S. cargoes to ship owners whose vessels have traded with Cuba since Janu-

ary 1. This is a mild start on a program, talked about since the blockade, to close hemisphere seaports and airports to ships and planes trading with Cuba, to freeze Cuban funds and cut off hemisphere communications with the island.

Even these measures, requiring joint action by the members of the Organization of American States (OAS), are insufficient to deal with the problem. But at least they would make support of Castro more expensive for the Soviets.

As Senator STENNIS says, most of his subcommittee hearings will have to be held in secret executive session—"but at the same time, I hope that we can get out to the American people the basic facts we develop."

This is of vital importance. There is great confusion in the public mind as to what is going on in Cuba and what the U.S. Government is doing about it. On the basis of available information, what is being done appears far short of the hard, firm policies Senator STENNIS suggests.

War Veterans Salute J. Edgar Hoover

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, last fall, a great American was honored by one of the most distinguished war veterans' organization in the United States. I am speaking of the Gold Medal of Merit awarded to the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, J. Edgar Hoover, last November, by the Jewish War Veterans.

This honor, coupled with a lifetime honorary membership in the organization, is the highest recognition presented by the Jewish War Veterans.

The inscription on the plaque accompanying the Medal of Merit reads:

In recognition of outstanding and meritorious services in the battle for civil rights and liberties. His integrity and devotion to justice will be remembered forever.

I can think of no person more deserving of this award. In his 39 years as Director of the FBI, J. Edgar Hoover has quietly but effectively advanced the cause of civil rights and civil liberties. His devotion to the fair and impartial administration of justice for all citizens, while protecting our basic rights and privileges from those who would destroy them, has earned for him a prominent place in our history.

J. Edgar Hoover has most significantly advanced the cause of liberty by impartially advancing the cause of justice. His record of transforming the FBI from a politically dominated and inept organization in the early 1920's into the most trusted and effective crime-fighting agency in the world is indeed a landmark which benefits every American.

I think the greatness of J. Edgar Hoover can also be measured by his humility. For example, he accepted the award from the Jewish War Veterans, "on behalf of the men and women of the FBI." I think Mr. Hoover's remarks are

than 4 percent a year. In addition, the formula provides 13 cents an hour in fringes.

In the dock strike, some of the added cost of the settlement proposed by the presidential board may ultimately be picked up by American taxpayers in the form of shipping subsidies.

Not all of business, however, is subsidized. It is at this point that the strike threat for the future grows.

While the unions are described as emboldened by their political strength, and in a mood to make big demands, the attitude of employers has hardened.

#### WHY EMPLOYERS BALK

Several reasons are cited for the increasing resistance of employers to pay raises and other additions to costs.

They are no longer able to pass on added costs in the form of higher prices. Prices are held in check, both by political and economic pressures.

Employers say they are under pressure to hold down costs—and prices—to meet foreign competition in the United States and to broaden markets overseas.

The efforts of employers to curb costs takes two forms—resistance to raises in pay, and increasing automation as a way of reducing the need for labor.

Unions, thus, find themselves fighting not only for higher pay but also for protection of their jobs as well.

Strikes, and threats of strikes, tend to grow out of a situation of this kind. A major cause of the shipping strike, for example, was the effort of shipping companies to reduce the size of work crews. The issue was finally dropped for the time being, and settlement was limited mainly to pay raises and fringe benefits, as shown in the chart on this page.

The threat of strikes is increased when unions make demands in new fields, as they are now doing. These new fields include profit sharing and two union-proposed remedies for unemployment: shorter workweeks and sabbatical leaves for older workers.

#### WHAT'S AHEAD IN STEEL?

In steel negotiations, which are set for this summer, the Steelworkers Union is expected to demand sabbatical leaves, along with higher pay.

Some employers in the steel industry already have indicated they will fight to hold down costs of any changes in their contracts. It is out of this struggle that the strike threat arises for this year.

The steel industry faces trouble again in 1964, when contracts expire. The union then is expected to press for its long-range goal of a shorter workweek.

The United Auto Workers Union is preparing to push for two of its major goals in the auto industry next year. One of these is profit sharing, the other is a shorter workweek. The companies seem certain to resist.

More immediately, threats of major strikes lie ahead against the railroads, over demands of workers for pay raises and moves by employers to reduce featherbedding. Thus a crisis on the railroads could come at any time.

That is not all. Contracts expire in many major industries in 1963—among them, rubber, shipbuilding, communications, aluminum, electrical-equipment manufacturing, coal mining and paper manufacturing.

#### MOOD: ROUGH ON BOTH SIDES

The walkouts on the east and gulf coasts and against big-city newspapers, thus, could be just the beginning of an era of big and costlier strikes.

The reason: Unions are in a more aggressive mood, and employers are offering more and more resistance to costly settlements.

## An Excellent Reason for the Passage of H.R. 524

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by J. A. Livingston, which appeared in the January 3, 1963, edition of the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin.

Corporations would not be so quick to grant these restricted stock options if my bill, H.R. 524, were to become law. They are one of the rankest forms of discrimination and if the proceeds from exercising the option were to be treated as ordinary income for tax purposes there would certainly be less of these shenanigans.

Mr. Livingston's article follows:

**HEADS, AND EXECUTIVES WIN—TAILS, THEY WIN EVEN MORE**

(By J. A. Livingston)

"Outrageous. Season's greetings."

That's how Lewis D. Gilbert, self-appointed oneman stockholder vigilante committee, inscribed a copy of Texas Instruments, Inc., recent proxy statement. In this instance, he cannot be accused of overburdening facts.

The officers and directors of Texas Instruments are asking stockholders to create for them what stockholders can't create for themselves. They want a "fairy godmother" committee to wave a magic wand so that they—the executives—can capitalize on the decline in Texas Instruments stock from a high of \$206.75 a share in 1961 to a low of \$49 last year. It's now around 60.

When Texas Instruments was one of the glamor babies on the New York Stock Exchange, its high-vaulting movements brought comfort and joy to officers who held options to buy stock at \$28.50 and \$37.75 a share. They needed no fairy godmother then. They were masters of their destiny, captains of success.

#### GLAMOR BURSTS

As the stock advanced in Wall Street, the price on additional options likewise rose. Some day, Texas Instruments would hit \$500 maybe; perhaps an even \$1,000. So, an option at \$178.75 a share was a genuine incentive.

Then the glamor burst. The "amour pocketbook" of options was sorely deflated. Texas Instruments options lost their cash-and-carry value.

To soothe the "amour pocketbook" of officials, directors have latched on to an idea developed by the Aluminum Co. of America in 1958. A "fairy godmother" committee would cancel the old options and issue new ones at prices escalated downward to the fall on the New York Stock Exchange.

#### INCENTIVE PADES

**Rationale:** Options are granted to executives as an incentive to work conscientiously and remain with the company. But when options lose their cash-and-carry value, this incentive seemingly disappears. Yet, you could argue the other way: That executives ought to be so humiliated by the drop in the stock below option prices that they would work all the harder to get the stock

up to where it had been—and so make their options valuable.

J. E. Jonsson, Texas Instruments chairman, offers stockholders this justification of the "fairy godmother" committee.

"Because of declines in the market value of our common stock, options held by many key persons . . . do not fulfill the plan's basic purposes . . ."

"While the board of directors has the power to cancel outstanding options by mutual agreement and grant new options . . . based on current market values, the board believes that action of this nature should be taken only pursuant to an amendment of the plan."

#### DOUBLE PENALTY

If stockholders approve the proposal, they will pay a double penalty for their beneficence:

First, they reduce the price of stock to officers and directors, who already get substantial pension- and profit-sharing benefits.

Second, as taxpayers, they will be giving officers and directors a free ride in the stock market at the 25 percent capital-gain tax rate. Stock optionees don't take up their stock—put up cash—until the market price is well above the option price. They are well padded, if not absolutely protected against a fall.

Stock options started out as heads-I-win, tails-I-can't-lose bounty to corporate officials. Now, with a one-way Wall Street escalation clause added, the option has become a heads-I-win, tails-I-win—more blessing.

Remember the joke about the executive who, on hearing about twilight sleep doing wonders for labor, complained to his physician, "Haven't you got anything like that for management?"

The physician now can offer the escalated stock option.

## It's Our Opinion

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, former Congressman Bob Rich, for whom so many people in the present House hold such high regard because of his steadfast support of economy and fiscal responsibility in the Federal Government, has sent me an editorial from the Fort Lauderdale News which certainly merits the serious consideration of all the Members of Congress. At this time, when we are considering action on the administration tax proposals, it certainly behooves us to give serious thought to the editorial comment in this fine pronouncement:

**AROUSING POPULACE CAN HALT ADMINISTRATION'S PLUNGE INTO FINANCIAL DISASTER**

(By Jack W. Gore)

From events of the past few months it has become frighteningly clear that thinking Americans who value the great heritage of freedom they have been given and who wish to preserve this Nation as an independent republic must gird themselves for a tremendous and all-important fight in the days ahead.

February 5, 1963

peace and to the survival of humanity would it consider providing inspectors for ships bound for Cuba. For the moment there is no question of the Red Cross moving into action and appointing inspectors.

November 14, 1962: U.S. State Department announces that air reconnaissance photographs show that the Soviet Union is constructing naval facilities at the fishing port of Banos, in northeastern Cuba. The State Department warns that appropriate measures will be taken if such facilities might represent a military threat to the United States or to the hemisphere.

November 15, 1962: West German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer (after talks with President Kennedy) declares to newsmen in Washington: "If you hear only of peaceful coexistence over and over again, then you gradually get used to believing that such a state exists with the other side. But in the future, when I hear peaceful coexistence mentioned again, I will think of Cuba."

Premier Fidel Castro (in a letter to U.N. Secretary General U Thant) warns that Cuba will shoot down any U.S. planes flying reconnaissance missions over Cuba.

November 16, 1962: United States declares it will continue its reconnaissance flights over Cuba and will take "appropriate measures" to protect its planes.

November 17, 1962: Three pro-Castro Cubans are arrested in New York on charges of planning sabotage. Two members of the Cuban delegation to the U.N. are also implicated in the conspiracy, and their recall is demanded by the U.S. Government.

November 18, 1962: Soviet Communist Party newspaper Pravda publishes an article defending Premier Khrushchev's policy in the Cuban crisis against the unlimited slander of critics within the Communist bloc (mainly the Communist Chinese). The article says: "They have undertaken an especially shameful and generally provocative campaign in connection with the crisis in the Caribbean. Once they talked hypocritically about peaceful coexistence, giving it an anti-Leninist content. Now they openly pursue a course of undermining peaceful coexistence and pushing mankind toward thermonuclear war."

The official Communist Chinese paper, People's Daily of Peking, attacks as pure nonsense the claim that the withdrawal of Soviet missiles from Cuba has saved the peace.

November 19, 1962: Premier Fidel Castro sends a message to U.N. Secretary General U Thant declaring that Cuba will not object if the Soviet Union removes the II-28 jet bombers from Cuba (which Castro had previously claimed as Cuban property). Castro describes the bombers as "antiquated equipment in relation to modern means of anti-aircraft defense."

November 20, 1962: President Kennedy announces (in a televised press conference) that he has ordered the lifting of the naval blockade of Cuba after being informed (ear-

lier the same day) by Soviet Premier Khrushchev that all of the II-28 bombers now in Cuba will be withdrawn in 30 days. Kennedy reports that progress has been made in fulfillment of his agreement with Premier Khrushchev on the withdrawal of Soviet missiles and other offensive weapons from Cuba. "Nevertheless," he says, "important parts of the understanding of October 27 and 28 remain to be carried out. The Cuban Government has not yet permitted the United Nations to verify whether all offensive weapons have been removed and no lasting safeguards have yet been established against the future introduction of offensive weapons back into Cuba. Consequently \* \* \* the United States has no choice but to pursue its own means of checking on military activities in Cuba."

The importance of our continued vigilance is underlined by our identification in recent days of a number of Soviet ground combat units in Cuba. Although we are informed that these and other Soviet units were associated with the protection of offensive weapons systems and will also be withdrawn in due course, I repeat we would like nothing better than adequate international arrangement for the task of inspection and verification in Cuba."

Kennedy says that if these measures are carried out "and if Cuba is not used for the export of aggressive Communist purposes, there will be peace in the Caribbean." He adds: "We will not, of course, abandon the political, economic and other efforts of this hemisphere to halt subversion from Cuba, nor our purpose and hope that the Cuban people shall some day be truly free. But these policies are very different from any intent to launch a military invasion of the island." He expresses the hope that "the achievement of a peaceful solution of the Cuban crisis might well open the door to the solution of other outstanding problems."

#### PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

#### RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at \$1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

#### LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

#### GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

#### CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

#### CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.



Part 7 follows:

**PART 7: LET'S KEEP THE RECORD STRAIGHT—  
A SELECTED CHRONOLOGY ON CUBA AND CASTRO**

October 30-31, 1962: Secretary General U Thant (accompanied by 18 U.N. officials) in Havana for talks with Premier Fidel Castro with regard to U.N. supervision and verification of the dismantling and removal of Soviet missiles from Cuba. On his return to New York on October 31, U Thant says that he has been "reliably informed" that Soviet missiles in Cuba are being dismantled and that this operation will be completed by November 2. He also says that he has been informed that arrangements for shipping the missiles back to the Soviet Union are "in hand." He describes his talks with Castro as "fruitful."

October 31, 1962: White House announces that the arms blockade and air surveillance of Cuba (suspended during U Thant's visit) will be resumed on November 1, because of "the absence of effective United Nations arrangements." It is announced in Moscow that Premier Khrushchev is sending First Deputy Premier Anastas I. Mikoyan on an urgent mission to Cuba.

Communist Chinese newspaper Jenmin Jih Pao (People's Daily) publishes an editorial which indirectly accuses Soviet Premier Khrushchev of yielding to the "U.S. imperialist attempt to browbeat the people of the world into retreat at the expense of Cuba." "There is no doubt that . . . this latest struggle of the Cuban people against U.S. imperialist aggression will have the firm support of the entire Socialist camp. China's 650 million people have stood consistently and firmly at the side of the Cuban people. We are fully convinced that the Cuban people, under their great leader Premier Castro, will . . . smash all U.S. imperialist acts of aggression and intervention."

November 1, 1962: Communist Chinese Note to Cuba (made public in Peking) gives "unreserved support" to Cuba's "just demands" which include U.S. evacuation of Guantanamo. The note assures the Cuban people that China will stand by them and "fight against our common enemy, U.S. imperialism, to the very end."

Premier Fidel Castro (in a radio-television broadcast to the Cuban people) categorically rejects any international inspection of the withdrawal of Soviet missiles from Cuba. He also turns down a Soviet proposal (transmitted to him by U.N. Secretary General U Thant) that the International Red Cross Committee be entrusted with the task of inspection. Before Mr. Thant made his trip to Havana, the Soviet Union had suggested that the Red Cross organization be used for the inspection. Castro says that "we respect the Soviet decision to withdraw their strategic weapons," and that Cuba is not trying to hinder their withdrawal. He declares: "If we have any misunderstanding with the Soviets they must be discussed only among the principals and not before the world. We trust the principles of the Soviet Union. Between the Soviet Union and Cuba there will never be a breach."

November 2, 1962: President Kennedy (in a broadcast report to the Nation on the Cuban crisis) says that aerial reconnaissance shows that "the Soviet missile bases in Cuba are being dismantled, their missiles and related equipment are being crated and the fixed installations at these sites are being destroyed." He declares that the United States will "follow closely the completion of this work through a variety of means, including aerial surveillance, until such time as an equally satisfactory international means of verification is affected." He says that the quarantine will remain in effect until "adequate procedures can be developed for international inspection of Cuba-bound

cargoes," and adds that the International Committee of the Red Cross would be an "appropriate agent" for this task. He asserts that "progress is now being made toward the restoration of peace in the Caribbean."

Soviet First Deputy Premier Anastas I. Mikoyan arrives in Havana for talks with Premier Castro.

November 4, 1962: Meeting in New York between John J. McCloy, chairman of the U.S. coordinating committee on Cuba, and Vasily V. Kuznetsov, special Soviet representative for the U.S.-Soviet-U.N. talks on Cuba. "The United States was reported . . . to have protested that the Soviet Union had failed to remove jet bombers from Cuba. Reliable sources said that John J. McCloy . . . made the protest to Vasily V. Kuznetsov on November 4 . . . . These sources said that recent U.S. reconnaissance photographs showed no reduction in the number of bombers—most of them still in packing cases—at an air base near Havana. The planes are IL-28's, which are capable of carrying nuclear bombs."

"Soviet Ilyushin-28 medium bombers . . . are still being unpacked and assembled in Cuba [the U.S.] Government has learned. By instruction of . . . President [Kennedy], Mr. Kuznetsov was warned [by McCloy]. It was learned that the Cuban crisis could revert to its most acute stage if the Russians turn over the bombers to Premier Fidel Castro."

November 5, 1962: Official Communist Chinese newspaper Jenmin Jih Pao publishes an editorial rejecting any "appeasement" toward the United States in the Cuban crisis and offering "full support" for Cuba's rejection of U.N. supervision over withdrawal of Soviet missile bases from Cuba.

The International Red Cross Committee declares [in Geneva] that it has been informed through the U.N. of Premier Castro's agreement to its representatives inspecting Cuba-bound ships to determine whether they carry offensive weapons.

November 6, 1962: U.S. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson confers (in New York) with Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vasily V. Kuznetsov. After the meeting, Stevenson says: "The missiles are moving out and the talks are moving on."

November 7, 1962: Soviet Premier Khrushchev announces (at a reception in the Kremlin on the 45th anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution) that the Soviet Union has taken its rockets out of Cuba and that they are "probably" on their way back to the Soviet Union. He asserts that there was a total of 40 Soviet rockets in Cuba.

Subsequently the U.S. Defense Department announces: "The Soviet Union has reported ships are leaving Cuba with missiles aboard. Arrangements are being made with Soviet representatives for contact with these ships by U.S. naval vessels and for counting the missiles being shipped out." (The United States and the Soviet Union also reach agreement that inbound Soviet vessels headed toward Cuba will be inspected by the International Red Cross Committee.)

November 8, 1962: U.S. Defense Department announces that aerial reconnaissance shows that "all known" offensive missile bases in Cuba have been dismantled; "significant items of equipment" have been moved from the missile sites to port areas; "a substantial number of missile transporters have been loaded on to the main decks of certain Soviet cargo vessels . . . and several of these vessels have already departed Cuban ports." The statement also says: "Within the next 24 hours (the United States expects to obtain additional confirmation through the close alongside observation of Soviet vessels by U.S. naval vessels. It is understood Soviet vessels will cooperate in this. The Cuban Government has informed other members of the United Nations that the

bombers sent to Cuba by the Soviet Union are Cuban property and will not be returned."

November 9, 1962: U.S. Defense Department reports that U.S. Navy vessels have intercepted five Soviet cargo ships outward bound from Cuba. Three of the ships were carrying missiles back to Russia. No Americans boarded the Soviet ships which were inspected by U.S. destroyers which pulled alongside and helicopters which flew overhead.

Venezuela (at a special session of the OAS Council in Washington) presents documentary evidence (which is not made public) linking the Castro regime with recent sabotage and subversion by Venezuelan Communists.

November 10, 1962: Havana Communist daily Hoy reports that Soviet economic aid to Cuba has amounted to \$912 million since the first Soviet-Cuban trade agreement was signed in February 1960. Soviet aid is reported by Hoy to have been distributed as follows: New industrial plants, machinery and equipment, \$192 million; food, \$130 million; raw materials, \$416 million; trucks and transportation, \$131 million. In addition, some 3,000 Cubans (according to Hoy) have been or are being trained in the Soviet Union. "Informed sources (in Washington) said that in addition to the economic aid, Russia and her satellites have delivered at least \$1 billion in military hardware to the Caribbean island, excluding the strategic missiles that are now being shipped back to the Soviet Union."

November 11, 1962: U.S. Deputy Secretary of Defense, Roswell L. Gilpatric, announces that the United States has counted 42 medium-range missiles being removed from Cuba on Soviet ships. He declares that the United States cannot be certain "that 42 was the maximum number that the Soviets brought to Cuba. With regard to the IL-28 bombers which the Soviet Union sent to Cuba, Gilpatric says: "We hold the Soviet responsible for the types of military equipment which it has furnished to Castro and as of the present time, we regard the removal of those bombers as within the capacity of the Soviets to bring about." He also says: "We regard aerial surveillance as a part of our inherent self-defense, a means of protecting our country as we would through any form of intelligence collection. The extent to which we will need to rely on continued air surveillance over Cuba will depend again on what the nature of the threat is that remains in Cuba after the Soviets have completed, if they do complete, the undertakings made by Premier Khrushchev to President Kennedy."

November 12, 1962: International Chamber of Shipping (consisting of independent shipping associations in 18 maritime nations outside the Communist bloc) rejects, at a meeting in London, a U.S.-sponsored proposal recommending that member shipping associations should withdraw voluntarily from trade with Cuba.

Soviet First Deputy Premier Anastas Mikoyan (in a speech at Havana University) declares that the Soviet Government supports Premier Castro's five demands which he describes as "a program for peace in the Caribbean." He adds: "The Soviet Government will always be behind Premier Castro and the Cuban people."

November 13, 1962: Soviet Union and Cuba submit to U.N. Secretary General U Thant a joint proposal to settle the Cuban crisis. Although the nature of the proposal was not disclosed, usually reliable sources said that it would give neutralist ambassadors stationed in Havana a vaguely defined observer function.

The International Committee of the Red Cross (an all-Swiss body) issues a statement (in Geneva) specifying that only in a case that it considered a major threat to world

A558

The following column by David Lawrence in the Washington Evening Star of February 4 details the disastrous results of the President's widely heralded attack on the steel companies last year.

Under unanimous consent I insert the following editorial in the Appendix of the Record.

**MEANING OF STEEL PROFIT DECLINE—KENNEDY MOVES TO RESCIND PRICE RISE DEPLORED AS SLOWING INDUSTRY GROWTH**

A significant piece of news in the last few days casts doubt on the soundness of an administration economic theory, which is that, if the Government stimulates spending and thus increases the volume of sales, profits will rise.

Three of the biggest steel companies have just issued their annual reports. These show that, for the year 1962, although sales went up, profits went down. They show also the total effect of President Kennedy's error in judgment when last April he ordered governmental agencies to use all their powers to coerce the big steel companies into abandoning a proposed price increase of three-tenths of a cent a pound.

The United States Steel Corp.'s report for 1962 has just come out. The company's sales went up by \$163 million, but profits went down \$6 million. A few days later, the annual reports of the Bethlehem Steel Co. and the Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp. were published. They revealed the same thing, larger sales but smaller profits. All three companies continued their reduced dividend payments. How long will investors be inclined to supply funds for new equipment if the outlook for dividends is discouraging?

Also, even after taking into account the new tax rules permitting larger depreciation reserves, the United States Steel Corp.'s net profits for 1962 were \$6 million behind net profits for 1961.

Yet this narrow margin of profit comes when the total volume is up more than one million tons. In 1953 and again in 1955, the United States Steel Corp. had an output of 25 million tons of steel, but this volume steadily went down until it reached 18 million last year.

There have been few changes in steel prices in recent years, while expenses, largely wage costs, have steadily gone up faster than the employers could absorb them.

Even though the gross national product has risen, steel has faced a steadily decreasing volume of sales in the last few years. This is because previous high sales were due primarily to wartime conditions or to the catching up by buyers in connection with periods of recession or strikes or threats of strikes.

Growth must be at a normal rate to make a steady increase in profits from a larger volume of sales. Wages cannot go up out of proportion to the rate of profit increase and yet maintain a healthy condition. That's really the fundamental trouble with the American economy today, and the administration has not faced up to the facts. Thus, labor exercises a virtual monopoly throughout the industry and the Government sits by and allows the wage factor to be thrust into the business mechanism arbitrarily and without guidance or restraint.

Price is the crucial factor in modern industry. Nowhere has it been more conclusively demonstrated that misguided labor policies have dealt a severe blow to national progress than in steel. This industry does a volume of \$15 billion a year, and the fabricators and related manufacturing businesses do another \$15 billion in sales. So it is well worth while for the Government to take a good look at what its one-sided handling of the steel controversy last April has done to a major industry.

At least 100,000 steelworkers are today jobless. This means a lost payroll of \$500 million a year. Tax cuts will not help these unemployed persons, nor will "consumer spending" help increase profits unless wage costs are overcome either through new machinery or increased prices.

If the prices proposed for steel had gone into effect in April, they would never have been uniform anyway. They would have been selective so as to enable the companies to compete with foreign producers while, at the same time, moving up their own rates on certain products that Europeans cannot make competitively.

In this very complex system of price-making, the administration intervened and slowed down a \$30 billion industry. Yet Mr. Kennedy said on TV last December that, if he had it to do all over again, he would proceed exactly the same way he did before.

Perhaps last week's steel figures will be helpful in persuading the administration that the time has come to do something about the disruptive effects of high wage demands. For the present steel contract is coming up soon for possible reopening by labor. The union leaders on the national level are said to be hesitant to ask for wage increases now, but rumblings are heard among the local leaders who have political ambitions inside the unions. The administration could do a constructive job of education at these levels and give the steel industry a chance to recover before it is faced with more wage increases.

ing that we perhaps were making too many concessions to Cuba and the U.S.S.R.

It seemed reasonable and right that inspection and verification be made of the missiles removed from Cuba, since our country was making our willingness to negotiate the issue clear to the U.S.S.R., Cuba, and the world. But U Thant, although assuring us that his talks with Castro had been "fruitful," and assuring us that proper arrangements had been made for dismantling the missiles and shipping them back to the Soviet Union, could not assure us that their talks had borne the fruit we expected.

One bright spot in the picture appeared to be signs of a quarrel shaping up between the Soviet Union and the Red Chinese over the yielding of Khrushchev to what they term "U.S. imperialists attempt to browbeat the people of the world into retreat at the expense of Cuba." Even this had its drawbacks, however, because we knew if Red China's support of Cuba was substituted for the Soviets, our dealings with Red China would call for much more strength of purpose on our part since they were not members of the United Nations and we had no diplomatic relations with them. And while the American people's strength of purpose could not be doubted—the memory was still strong of the frustrations experienced in the Korean war in which we fought an enemy backed by the Red Chinese, in a war which it appeared could not actually be won by anyone.

We were offered the alternative of the International Red Cross assuming the task of inspecting Cuba-bound ships to determine whether or not they carried offensive weapons, in lieu of our continuation of the task which we assumed by "our quarantine." However, they failed to accept the task in the end and the problem was laid back in our laps.

The "fishing port" construction plan of the Soviet and Cuban Governments, which had created such consternation and anger in the Congress previous to the "quarantine" appeared to be moving ahead, although our State Department tried to reassure us that "appropriate measures" would be taken if such facilities represented a "military threat" to the United States or to the hemisphere. But these words had a familiar ring and we could not be sure what "appropriate measures" would mean.

When President Kennedy formally lifted the quarantine on November 20, 1962, after extracting a promise from the Soviets that the IL-28 bombers—also a bone of contention—would be removed from Cuba in 30 days—and uneasy peace seemed at last to shroud the entire Cuba-United States-Soviet Union issue.

And although the public seemed to need and want a little reassurance from time to time, the general feeling appeared to be that they felt they must, and could, trust their leadership. But those who felt differently were forced to merely try and preserve a calm attitude because, after all, they really had no place to go.

**Part 7: Let's Keep the Record Straight—  
 A Selected Chronology of Cuba and  
 Castro (October 30–31–November 20,  
 1962)**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. DON L. SHORT**

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, part 7 of my continued chronology of Cuba and Castro deals with the period when negotiations were underway between Secretary General U Thant of the United Nations and Premier Fidel Castro of Cuba, concerning United Nations supervision of the dismantling and removal of the Soviet missiles from Cuba.

We should keep in mind that in an interchange of messages between Soviet Premier Khrushchev and President Kennedy the United Nations was suggested as the proper agency to verify that the missiles were being removed and shipped back to the U.S.S.R. On October 28, 1962—detailed in part 6 of my chronology—Khrushchev announced in a message to the President that this was to be done under U.N. supervision, and was congratulated for his "statesmanlike decision" in a return message from the President, in which he pledged that the U.S. would not invade Cuba. This was followed by a five-point statement by Fidel Castro setting forth his conditions on whether the present crisis would or would not be resolved.

About this time the public began to be a little uneasy because of a growing feel-

Now, Mr. Llaca, please tell us in your own words, just what happened at the Bay of Pigs?

Mr. LLACA. Two armies fought at the Bay of Pigs. The Communist army had an arsenal of the most modern weapons produced by the Soviet Union. The Democratic army had a meager supply of obsolete weapons, of World War II and Korean war vintage. While the Communist artillery had a range of 9 miles, our artillery reached only 3 1/2 miles. While Communist aviation had jet fighters, the aviation that was going to defend freedom was made up of a few old B-28 bombers without even the tail gunner—sitting ducks for the Communist jet fighters.

Furthermore, the Soviet Union gave its full support to its Caribbean tyrant in the Assembly of the United Nations, while the Western World turned its back on the patriots who were fighting for freedom at the Bay of Pigs, as though our cause was unjust or illegal.

DEAN MANION. How did the Communist troops and your own troops behave in this battle?

Mr. LLACA. During the first hours of combat the Communists, believing that we were the vanguard of a powerful army, gave a poor account of themselves. More than 500 militiamen surrendered to companies of Battalion 1, 2, 3, 4, and 8. As everyone knows, our battalions consisted only of 180 soldiers.

As the military action progressed, Castro's troops began to find out that we had only a small, ill-equipped force without air cover. This assured them of victory and gave them a new outlook that made them regain their lost confidence. Having recovered their valor, they attacked us in an uninterrupted avalanche.

Our troops, in spite of our precarious situation, resisted courageously the onslaught, even when we knew from the start that we did not have an alternate plan for retreat nor the possibility of a Dunkirk.

From the morning of the 18th, defeat could be predicted. Communications had failed. The ships that carried our equipment were forced to retreat, or had been sunk by the Communist aviation. Our ammunition was rapidly running out.

In spite of this situation our troops did not lose their morale. On Wednesday the 19th, our supplies completely gone, and our men completely exhausted, we were forced to retreat.

By this time our 5 tanks—though handicapped by numerous defects such as turrets that did not rotate—put out of action more than 15 enemy tanks and our men had written a page of valor and patriotism for history.

Once on our own, we were forced to retreat to the swamps of Zapata. Many days of hunger, thirst and desperation followed while we traveled through mud and dirty stagnant water.

Our wounded fell unattended because we lacked medicines and medical assistance. Some of our men had found boats and took to the sea, only to find their death because of the lack of drinking water and food, aggravated by exposure to the tropical sun.

Those of us that took to the swamps had to eat roots and the fruit of trees that only the wild hogs consume.

Finally, we were captured and were on the road to a long cruel period of imprisonment, where we learned what the real meaning of Communist inhumanity stood for.

DEAN MANION. Mr. Llaca, how do you feel about this fiasco? I am sure that those of us who were comfortably seated in our homes while you fought at the Bay of Pigs for those principles of freedom that are so dear to all of us would like to know your feelings.

Mr. LLACA. This fiasco, which cost the lives of more than 100 young Cubans and caused untold misery and suffering, is one of the

most deplorable military actions in the history of the free world.

We landed in Cuba on April 17, 1961, full of hope. Two days later, on the 19th, only death and desolation remained. We felt bewildered. We suddenly realized, with preoccupation and sorrow, how the Soviet Union, thousands of miles away, had backed Castro to the hilt. We, who were fighting only 90 miles from our most powerful ally—the leader of the democratic world—were abandoned to our grim fate.

Today, 20 months after the invasion that has caused so much suffering, we stand for the same democratic ideals for which we fought. Let me hasten to make clear that we harbor no resentment against the United States. Your great country and ours are bound together by old and strong ties of affection and common destiny. However, we ask ourselves: Is the United States willing to back the ideals it professes, and for which it fought Spain, two World Wars, and Korea?

Is the United States going to aid and abet, by its vacillation and timidity, the ultimate victory of communism?

While the Soviet Union, at the snap of a finger, mobilizes all its resources to back tyranny and oppression, will the United States turn its back to those who fight for God, freedom, and law?

DEAN MANION. What is your solution to the Cuban problem?

Mr. LLACA. In our opinion, it is up to the Cubans to solve their own problems. This will avert the threat of a nuclear holocaust to the entire world, which could only happen if one of the two great powers should directly intervene in an armed conflict to liberate Cuba.

We are firmly convinced that the Cubans, who are ready and willing to fight communism, can defeat Castro. There are more than 30,000 young Cubans in exile anxious to make the supreme sacrifice for our country. All we need is that the United States and the Western Powers, realizing what is at stake in Cuba, supply the necessary armaments, equipment, and facilities.

We are striving to show our allies, in particular the Government of the United States, that we have the necessary capacity to assume full responsibility for this struggle and that the free world should have enough confidence in us to provide the modern armaments needed.

If the Soviet Union can trust the Cuban Communists enough to give them first-class military equipment, the free world must likewise have confidence in us and provide their best weapons.

Today's world is like a big glass mansion housing a Red elephant—the Soviet Union—and a White elephant—the United States. A little Red ant—Fidel Castro—has crept into this glass mansion and is stinging the White elephant. If the White elephant attempts to destroy the little Red ant, the Red elephant will move to defend her. This might cause the complete destruction of the glass mansion. What, then, is the solution? Simple. A little White ant must creep in to fight and destroy the little Red ant.

DEAN MANION. Mr. Llaca, Would you like to send a message to the American people through the Manion forum?

Mr. LLACA. Yes, Dean Manion, and we would like to thank you for the opportunity which you are affording us to do so. Our message to the American people is not only a message of friendship, but also a warning of the grave peril that is threatening the free world.

For more than 40 years, the forces of barbarism have advanced from the East. Up to now the West has been unable to find the adequate means to stop and defeat them. It is essential for our victory and the survival of Western civilization that a policy be quickly found and urgently implemented.

The liberation of Cuba would be the first step in the right direction.

By defeating communism in our country we will demonstrate that the Communist contention that their victory is inevitable, is a complete falsehood—nothing but propaganda. We are convinced that the forces of God, on whose side we fight, will inevitably defeat the barbaric forces of evil. For this decisive battle we count on the full backing of our sister republics, especially the United States which has traditionally been the bulwark of freedom, democracy, and human rights.

DEAN MANION. Thank you, Enrique Llaca, for the courage you have shown in fighting communism and for the heroic attempt you made to free your country at the Bay of Pigs.

Americans who love liberty and who understand the lethal nature of the deadly Red weapon that has now been built upon our doorstep in your country will hear your account of the Bay of Pigs battle with an overpowering sense of shame. I hope and pray that this sensation will be followed by a nationwide spirit of resolution and determination to help you and your oppressed countrymen to restore freedom and national independence to Cuba.

My friends, last October when President Kennedy announced that this country was prepared, singlehanded if necessary, to drive the Communist menace from Cuba, he stirred an immediate favorable response from the people of the United States and unanimous support from the governments of Latin America. Since that moment of courage and resolution we have drifted back to a Cuban policy of vacillation and appeasement.

Last January 13 (Chicago Tribune), Senator KEATING, of New York, produced figures showing that Khrushchev is constantly increasing his arms shipments to Cuba and that Castro is stronger militarily now than ever before. How does our Government justify its merciless pursuit of the anti-Communist leader in Katanga which is 10,000 miles away, while it pacifies and protects this aggressive Red Communist Castro arsenal on our own threshold?

What possible explanation of this insane and contradictory policy can we make to people like Enrique Llaca, who have faced up to this horrible menace to civilization with the courage that is demanded of all God-fearing, freedom-loving men who understand the diabolical nature of this enemy?

When will our Government officially declare that communism is intolerable and that all of our policies henceforth will be predicated upon that primary self-evident truth? That official declaration will follow your firm personal resolution to bring it about. Start now by sending Enrique Llaca's statement to your Congressman. Ask him to put this broadcast into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

## President's Faulty Economic Policies Undermining Our Economy

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, if any proof is needed that the faulty economic policies of the Kennedy administration are not helping our economic health and growth, the current annual reports of the steel companies should provide it.



1963

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A555

pressways at distances of roughly 2½, 7, and 10 miles from the city center. Another plan would provide for building an elongated north-south expressway to the east of Rome, which would steer city expansion and the press of population along this route and away from the historic center.

## MODERN IN STOCKHOLM

Stockholm, with its T-Bana, has one of the most modern subway systems in Europe. Indeed, Sweden might well qualify as the land of the happy commuter. With an auto ownership (one car to five people) which comes closest to United States' levels of any country in Europe, the Swedes have managed to combine the best features of both road and rail service. The first sections of Stockholm's subway system were opened in 1950, and expansion is still going on. Today, a half million passenger rides are recorded daily along its 25 miles of lines in smooth-running cars, through gleamingly modernistic, escalator-equipped stations.

Stockholm is of further interest since it, like Copenhagen, has a population of slightly over 1 million people. European city planners use this key number as a rule-of-thumb in justifying a subway. In other words, if a city has that many people, or anticipates having that number in the future, it should lose no further time in building an underground rail system.

Accordingly, the growing city of Oslo, which already has about 600,000 people in its metropolitan area, has embarked on a \$100 million subway building program. Like most cities, Oslo's population expansion is taking place not downtown but in the suburbs; so that the outlook indicates more people will be riding longer distances by rail.

About 30 of America's cities have populations of 600,000 and over, and hence fall into Europe's rule-of-thumb subway category. One of the major differences, however, is that except for a handful of cities, most U.S. urban areas have been built on a horizontal rather than a vertical pattern. That is, instead of having concentrations of apartment buildings, our average medium-size city has a central commercial area surrounded by sprawling suburbs of individual homes. Yet the experts say that mass transit operates well only where volume is present in concentrated quantities. European officials, when asked if their urban transportation approach would be different under conditions existing in the United States: (1) More people living in scattered individual homes rather than in apartments, and (2) a greater popular ownership of automobiles generally answered that in the larger cities the same emphasis would still go into mass transit to serve downtown areas, but that greater stress would be placed on the problem of collecting traffic volume for rail flows—by means of circumferential roads, parking lots at suburban rail stations and bus operations on the city fringes.

## MATTER OF COMFORT

What about the all-important matter of personal convenience and comfort in commuting when in Europe? Again, a city's size seems the key factor. Peak hours bring fierce crowding in big cities like London, Paris or Rome. In fact, the urban transport problem really boils down to a problem of handling the peak-hour loads from 8 a.m. to 10 a.m. and from 4:30 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. Transit officials, in effect, have a huge, expensive factory on their hands which is used only about 4 hours a day, and almost not at all on weekends.

Londoners, with 10 million people in their metropolitan area, have given up hope for comfort at peak hours. Then street traffic jams are unbearable—as is the crush on the underground.

London Transport has taken all possible

steps to increase capacity of present subway lines—lengthening the average train from 8 to 10 cars and loading the maximum number of trains on track. And now proposed is construction of the 11½-mile-long Victoria Line subway which would connect with every existing underground route and many surface railroad stations, and redistribute much of the load in downtown London. Yet the problem of handling this peak passenger load remains. As one official cogently commented: "I don't believe London or any other city has enough wealth to provide enough capacity to meet peak demands. Demand itself must be attacked. The peak hour movements must be spread out by staggering work hours. And since exhortation doesn't seem to achieve this, perhaps the final answer is simply to let overcrowding build up such back pressures that people will stop traveling at peak hours or else move their offices out to the suburbs."

## THE PROBLEM IN MOSCOW

The traffic problem is far less pronounced in Moscow and Iron Curtain capitals, the reason apparently being the low level of auto ownership. For instance, while there is 1 car to every 3 Americans, there is only 1 for 330 Russians, forcing Muscovites to use the 50-mile-long Moscow Metro not just for traveling to and from work but also throughout the day. Communist officials in Moscow related that only 35 percent of their total daily travel volume of 3 million riders is handled in the 4 peak hours. This compares with 80 to 90 percent in Western cities.

It costs 5 kopecks (about 5½ cents) to ride anywhere in Moscow on the Metro. The Communists expect surface traffic of taxis, buses, and trucks to increase considerably in coming years and therefore are anxious to have the people continue to use rail transit instead of cars—if and when available. The Communists are even thinking of allowing free travel on the Metro, official thinking being that it will be cheaper to the overall community to provide free subway fares than to attempt to build enough highways and parking lots to accommodate Western-style street traffic.

Much of this same viewpoint exists in Western Europe. Holland has been conducting studies and holding meetings among top transportation leaders to consider paying the full bill for constructing highways to handle auto traffic in cities like Amsterdam and Rotterdam. The unpublicized conclusion was that such a program would not only bankrupt the Nation, but might even increase street congestion by inducing people to buy and use still more autos. Further development of rail transit is therefore being pushed to the hilt. And the radical step of barring all private automobiles from downtown streets may eventually be taken.

A city's subway system in Europe is expected to have a fare structure which will cover its operating and equipment costs but never any tax payments and seldom the capital investment for building tunnels and laying track. Government units generally put up the money for original construction and charge it off to general public services. If fares were raised high enough to cover both transit operating and original construction costs, Europeans fear they would probably be so high that customers would not be attracted out of their own cars. The major problem is that motorists add up and compare commuting costs in terms of gas money and parking fees and ignore car purchase and repair bills. No transit operator can do this, however; so fares must cover all his expenses.

## THEY EXPRESSED HORROR

Many transport authorities overseas have visited the United States and closely studied

America's problems in order to acquire ideas on what to do with their own ballooning automobile traffic.

These informed officials expressed outright horror at the way Americans build expressways into cities with apparently little thought of coordinating these fine auto roads with existing surface and underground railroads. And where rail services exist in American cities, Europeans are incredulous that public officials want these facilities to pay their way all the way, and in addition, contribute tax revenues to general Government purposes (some of which sometimes include the creation of competitive facilities). Railroads and subways on the continent do not pay taxes because they are publicly owned, in the first place, and because they usually run at vast deficits, in the second.

As seen from abroad, one of the major U.S. problems (perhaps the major one) is that governments here have set up elaborate systems for obtaining a massive flood of money from highway users to be spent for highway purposes, while no system exists for acquiring money for rail transit. Thus, if cities are to develop rail transit, they are faced with the need to levy special taxes, float special bond issues or dip into general government revenues which are already over obligated for myriad other purposes. One of President Kennedy's current proposals for urban transportation legislation attempts to right this lopsided road-rail situation by providing funds for transit development from the Federal Treasury. The big cities themselves, meanwhile, have done all too little at the local level to meet this challenge, and much of what they were doing has now ground to a near-halt as everyone waits to see if Washington (meaning the U.S. taxpayer) will put up the dough.

## FOR PRIVATE OPERATION

Despite their background of public transport ownership, Europeans don't hesitate to go to bat for private operation of mass transit. In fact, they insist that municipalities seldom give private companies an honest chance. An official of the International Union of Public Transport in Brussels, the association representing the world's big urban transit systems, told this reporter: "You can't expect private businesses to sustain operating losses indefinitely and also bleed them white by taxation."

So the first step that virtually all experts everywhere agree should be taken here is to wipe out all taxation on mass transit facilities. The tax savings would give operators a better chance to tailor fares to build up passenger volume and to buy attractive new equipment and services.

## Let's Stop Exalting Punks

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, "It is not what a man does that seems to count today—it's what he can get away with" is the theme of a disturbing but observing article in the January issue of the Reader's Digest. Indicating that traditional values of honesty, hard work, and sacrifice have been largely replaced by acceptance of dishonesty, inferior work, and weakness, the article calls for new

A556

heroes who will search for the best in man.

Good pay for inferior work and a "you're no better than I am" attitude of equality are principal factors in the destruction of merit as a standard of human conduct and performance.

The policy of the Federal Government in paying everybody, everywhere, all the time, for anything, anyplace has not exactly exalted human virtue, I might add.

The Digest article follows:

#### LET'S STOP EXALTING PUNKS

(By Marya Mannes, novelist, critic, and TV personality)

The hottest Broadway musical this past year has been "How To Succeed in Business Without Really Trying." For a time its major contender was "I Can Get It for You Wholesale." The "heroes" of both shows are men who ride over others to get what they want. The young man characterized in the first hit is funny and appealing; the young man heading the second hit is brash and ruthless. But both are egocentrics; both are amoral, unethical, and blissfully numb to the prickings of conscience.

The elevation of such heroes to stardom, not only in musicals but in the majority of plays, novels, and movies of the last 15 years, is coincidental only in that it coincides with a breakdown in public morality following World War II, a cynical acceptance of dishonesty as the natural state of man. After the legends of heroism came the truth as many saw it: the stripping of illusions from the public eye; proof of the futility of sacrifice, honor, nobility, and all those qualities which made one man better than another. Enter then the hero-punk, firmly committed to the comforting democratic principle that no man is better than his fellows.

The "punk" is not a new phenomenon; every age has seen the ascension to power of those unfit for it. What concerns us here and now is that, in our day, he is not only accepted and excused but celebrated. His life is deemed important, his opinions carry weight, his example is followed. Under the banner of ambition, self-interest and opportunism, this shabby image of man marches on, inflated by the bellows of press-agentry.

Look here, if you will, rather than toward broken homes, poor housing and poverty, for the making of delinquents. Look here for the source of corruption, whether it be questionable business deals amounting to millions or false deductions on a tax return. A society reflects what it admires; a week's admiration for men like astronauts Glenn, Carpenter and Schirra hardly makes up for 51 weeks of admiration for men without honor.

Of these the smart operator, the big fixer, is foremost in the news—after he has been found guilty of crimes ranging from fraud to theft on a giant scale. Until the moment of exposure he not only has prospered but has been courted, envied and admired by men who did not question the sources of his power. In any major scandal like the Billie Sol Estes brew are the names of law-abiding citizens who should have known better. But our society finds it convenient to tolerate the pursuit of the extra buck; everybody does it, so why shouldn't I? And if "it" walks the wavering line between the questionable and the illegal, who's to know?

Then, of course, we come to the politician. Where money and publicity are corrupters in other areas, votes are the corrupters here. Most Americans have been brought up to believe that politics and politicians are dirty, blithely ignoring the fact that it is we who elect them. It cannot be denied that it is

possible for the punk to attain prestige and power in Congress and in the State capital because the line between honest compromise and connivance, between accommodation and betrayal, is often too fine for easy detection. That the smart politician may be dishonest matters less than that he is charming, homey, and a holder of high office. After all, was not a Boston mayor elected time and again in spite of conviction for offenses which sent him to prison?

Now let us focus on the leader of a big labor union, as he addresses its thousands of members. You know him well: companion of gangsters, crony of strong-arm men, he has amassed power that touches the Nation's security. He has achieved this power through a combination of acumen, ruthlessness, and the acquiescence of underlings as greedy as he. In recent decades labor leaders have fought for their workers' just rights and rewards. Now the rewards are often channeled into luxuries for the unscrupulous few, and into fees for lawyers retained to keep them out of jail. Power devoid of responsibility is the kingdom of our labor boss: the punk.

Beauty devoid of responsibility might be a way of describing a familiar kind of female punk: the Hollywood star who makes marriage a game of musical chairs (or beds) and love a five-star final. Yet, however severely the public may cluck over her tempestuous sexual engagements, however many columnists may deplore their greedy rotation, the press treats them as front-page news. A whole generation of high school girls is tempted to envy this volatile goddess, and a whole generation of high school boys and their fathers is invited to yearn for her.

And what of the great pop singer? He never took singing lessons or learned to read music. But after canny press-agentry he is worth thousands of dollars a night. Reports that he has neglected his family, become a woman chaser and engaged in highly dubious business deals in no way impede his progress. By no standards of any kind was he ever an artist, yet he has become a power in the entertainment world and a household name in 50 million homes.

And here we come back to where we started: the audience or, if you will, society. Since these punks cannot succeed without public acceptance, our acceptance must be explored. Why is it possible for small talents to be great stars? For cheats to hold public office? For crooks to lead labor? Why have we so lowered our expectations of human behavior?

Some say that religion no longer plays a vital role in setting standards, that we may pay it lipservice but no heed. Some say that parents no longer pass on to their children a clear code of ethics. Some blame the school for not providing what the home neglects, and here I think a legitimate question can be raised concerning one particular aspect of education: the standards of craftsmanship. If the young were taught the basic requirements of a good job, they would be more critical of the singer without a voice, the star without talent. Untutored teenage consumers bear a large share of responsibility in elevating the punk. It is their money that buys the records of the bad singer, their ecstatic squeals that sustain him, their tastes that too many of the mass media cater to.

The makers of movies know that the restless, rebellious young will identify with the punk-hero; the makers of television crime shows know that the hero who solves all problems by smashing his fist into another man's jawbone will win their approval. Money, violence, success—these stir young

hearts empty of values and impatient with virtues. How can honesty be the best policy when the cheat gets by?

Prosperity is the punk's climate: a condition of general welfare where most citizens can earn good pay, even for inferior work, and receive the benefits of civilization without merit or serious effort. Combine this prosperity with a blurred concept of equality, and "I can be as good as you are" becomes "You're no better than I am." This viewpoint is a great comfort, for it condones the weaknesses and dishonesties to which man is heir and makes any effort to transcend them unnecessary.

Surely the punks have had their day. It is time now for heroes, for restoring man to his potential stature. Emerson wrote, "The search after the great man is the dream of youth and the most serious occupation of manhood." Only when people know the best in men will they learn to reject the least in men.

#### Cuban Freedom Fighter Gives His Version of Bay of Pigs Action

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

#### HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, because it seems impossible to get the truth from the administration concerning our policy in Cuba, the Bay of Pigs incident, and the present Soviet military buildup in this hemisphere, it is necessary for Members of Congress to gather all available information in order to piece the true story together. For this purpose, I include, as a part of these remarks, the following broadcast interview on the Mansion Forum with Enrique Llaica, Jr., one of the freedom fighters recently released:

#### WHO IS BETRAYING THE EFFORTS TO FREE CUBA FROM COMMUNISM.

DEAN MANION. In U.S. News & World Report of January 14, a Cuban veteran of the ill-fated Bay of Pigs invasion said this:

"We were promised the support of the Armed Forces of the United States. Over you will be air cover, we were told, and back of you the Navy and land forces of the United States . . . you cannot fail. We did not fail. We were betrayed." (U.S. News & World Report, Jan. 14, p. 46.)

This explains why a larger number of the ransomed Bay of Pigs prisoners refused to show up when President Kennedy addressed the group in Miami last December. One of the ransomed prisoners who was not present for the President's speech is Enrique Llaica, Jr., who is here with me now at this microphone.

Mr. Llaica was a young lawyer practicing in Havana when Castro came to power in 1959. He was never deceived by the bearded bandit and denounced him openly and at once in the Havana newspaper, *Diario De La Marina*. Llaica called Castro a Communist agent who planned to subvert Cuba and subject it to a Communist dictatorship.

Because he was telling the truth, Llaica was arrested by Castro and he went into exile in July of 1959. In February 1961, he entered a training camp where the April invasion was being prepared and served as supply officer on the SS *Houston* which was sunk at the Bay of Pigs by Communist aircraft.

<sup>1</sup> See "These Labor Abuses Must Be Curbed," the Reader's Digest, December 1962.